Analysis of Speech Act in Joe Biden's Victory Speech 2020

Lect. Mustafa Talib Mutashar Al.Juboury
Kerbala General Directorate, Ministry of Education, Iraq
Email: mt90iraq@gmail.com

 ## ABSTRACT
The purpose of language is strongly related to the goals of the speakers, the concepts they wish to transmit, and the listeners' prior knowledge. First, speakers want their audience to feel something after listening to them. Speakers must persuade listeners to recognize these objectives in order for them to be properly understood. Second, in order to effectively communicate concepts, speakers must take into account how their listeners think in their words. Thirdly, presenters need to have some idea of what their audience are thinking right now.

The study of the researcher is limited to Austin's and Searle's classifications, which can be found in the text of Joe Biden's victory speech.

The author restricts his discussion to the following topics in light of the preceding models:

1. What roles did the speech acts utilized in Joe Biden's victory speech serve?

2. What kinds of speech acts may be seen in the text of Joe Biden's acceptance speech؟

3. What are the most important Austin's and Searle's classifications that can be discovered in the text of Joe Biden's victory speech?

The researcher's goals in authoring this study are as follows:

1. To what extent do the speech acts Austin's and Searle's classifications, which can be found in the text of Joe Biden's victory speech, serve their intended purposes?

2. To examine the kind of speech acts described by Austin and Searle in the text of Joe Biden's victory speech?

3. How would you characterize the predominant speech act according to Austin's and Searle's classifications contained in the text of Joe Biden's victory speech?

Keywords: Speech act, Joe Biden's victory speech, Locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts.

1. Introduction

Language is a medium of communication that people use to engage with one another. Languages serve as a window onto the rest of the world, allowing people to experience things they could never have imagined or thought possible before.

Language, whether spoken or written, plays a significant role in the exchange of ideas. When giving peace of mind, one must also pay attention to linguistics and understanding. The goals and purpose will be made evident with comprehension. A person's ability to speak fluently is one of the qualities that may be improved with strong language skills. It is a component of spoken language. Therefore, the speaker must maintain interest by employing cohesiveness and coherence.

According to Stelmann (1982:291), is to facilitate communication. A speaker, a listener, and a signaling system or language are the three primary components of this activity. The signaling system must be used by both speakers and listeners. Speakers are the basis of communication. For instance, they choose to communicate some information in a specific way. Next, they choose signal. A certain speech constitutes this signal. Because they think it is suitable, they create it. The stated statement serves as a signal that the listeners pick up and utilize right away.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Previous Studies

Some academics do a discourse analysis of a coherent device that can be used in this research's earlier investigations. Some of these are research projects carried out by Kalilang (2009), Ali (2009), and Nusu (2013). Kalilang (2009) focused her thesis Formal Links (Cohesive Devices) on the article "Korea's stand in the face of global warming" in the Korea English magazine. She came to the conclusion that lexical coherence, parallelism, reference, substitution, and conjunction are the sorts of cohesive devices that apply to every phrase in the article.

In The Jakarta Post Newspaper's article titled "Indonesian Bureaucratic Reform in The Making," Yurni (2012) discusses her thesis on the analysis of cohesive devices. She restricts her writing to four sorts of cohesiveness, most of which are employed in speech. The researcher identified four different forms of cohesive devices—reference, replacement, conjuction—and came to the conclusion that lexical cohesiveness was the most often utilized cohesive device in the Jakarta Post article.

The papers above demonstrate that similar study has been done in the past, but that it was limited to examining grammatical or lexical coherence in written conversation. While concentrating on the usage of grammatical and lexical coherence in spoken conversation as the subject of analysis. This research continued earlier investigations and anticipated completion of those earlier studies.

According to Patil (1994: 233), language is an integral aspect of our daily existence. It serves as the primary means of conveying messages, ideas, thoughts, and views. It places us in the society in which we reside; it is a social activity that establishes and progressively establishes our place in a variety of social networks and organizations. We sometimes actually depend on its proper use, and there are times when we need to

be understood correctly. A possible explanation for why language and linguistic communication have become such a hot issue among linguists, lawyers, psychologists, and philosophers is that language is engaged in almost every aspect of human life.

2.2 Speech Acts and Performatives

Speaking a language involves completing speech actions, such as declarations, demands, inquiries, and promises, according to Searle (1967: 67). All linguistic communication, according to Searle, includes linguistic speaking acts. Speech actions are therefore the fundamental or minimum building blocks of linguistic communication. They are not, despite appearances, simple artificial language constructs; knowing them and being familiar with the context in which they are used are frequently necessary for determining the true meaning of the entire speech. Speech acts are utilized in everyday conversations as well as in comedic or dramatic situations, for example.

The issue of speech actions was first raised by J.L. Austin, an American language philosopher. He made these insights while speaking at Harvard University in 1955, and his renowned book How to Do Things with Words was released after his death. Austin provides fundamental concepts and study topics and makes the distinction between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. According to Lyons, Austin's principal goal was to refute the idea that language's most intriguing role was to make true or false claims. (Wardhaugh 1992, p. 283)

Austin demonstrates that there are unquestionably more uses for language. Austin is the one who presents fundamental concepts and research topics. He also creates a new category of utterances called performatives, according to Lyons (1981:173).

The idea of speech acts has historically focused on performatives as the first speech acts to be studied. According to Austin, a performative is an expression that carries a certain kind of verb (a performative verb) that causes it to carry out an action. In other words, when someone uses a performative, they are literally acting out what they are saying.

Austin goes on to say that a performative does not describe, record, or constate anything, unlike a constative, which can either be felicitous or infelicitous. He also asserts that a performative is a first person indicative active statement in the simple present tense from a grammatical perspective. Although this criteria is vague, Austin offers a hereby test since he discovers that only performative verbs may collocate with this adverb in order to separate the performative usage from other potential uses of the first person indicative active pattern (Ibid: 174).

1. I thus tender my resignation from the office of Czech Republic President.

b. I now commit to rising at seven every morning.

The first line would make sense in some circumstances, but the second would sound pretty odd. This implies that while (1b) is not a performative, (1a) is.

Austin first defines performatives, after which he makes a fundamental contrast between them. He distinguishes between explicit and implicit performatives, two main kinds (Ibid.).

207

2.3 Explicit and Implicit Performatives

A performative is considered explicit when the speech inscription includes a phrase that clearly states the type of act being done. As Thomas (1995: 47) argues, an explicit performative comprises a performative verb and is thus primarily understood as a device that enables the speaker to completely eliminate any chance of misinterpreting the intent behind an expression.

 2. I'm telling you to go.

Will you depart?

In the first instance, the speaker uses an imperative statement in an effort to get the listener to leave. The speaker entirely eliminates any potential misinterpretation by using a performative verb. The point being made is obvious. The second utterance (2b), when taken out of its proper context, is very unclear. There are two ways to interpret it: either literally as a yes-or-no inquiry, or figuratively as an indirect request or even an order to go. The hearer may get perplexed, and he need not always be successful in deciphering the speaker's objective. An implied or main performative is (2b). Assuming Lyon is correct, this is non-explicit in the sense of the definition provided above since there is no statement in the utterance-inscription itself that explicitly states that this is to be interpreted as a request rather than a yes/no inquiry (Lyons, 1981: 176).

The two versions—explicit and implicit—are not equal. Speaking a directive in its explicit performative form rather than its implicit form has significantly more devastating consequences. Thomas continues by saying that because an explicit performative frequently seems to indicate an imbalance of power or a certain set of rights on the side of the speaker, people avoid utilizing them (Yule, 1996: 52).

Performative phrases "achieve their associated effects because there are precise rules tying the words to institutional procedures," according to Levinson (1983: 230). Distinct historical and cultural eras and civilizations have quite different institutional methods, thus they are not always the same (e.g. the institution of marriage in western and eastern societies). In order for the technique and the performative to be effective, according to Austin, the execution must take place under the proper conditions.

Adding to Austin's observations, Shiffrin (1994: 51) notes that "the circumstances allowing an act are varied: they include the existence of "an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect," the presence of "particular persons and circumstances," "the correct and complete execution of a procedure," and (when appropriate to the act) "certain thoughts, feelings, or intentions." These situations are more frequently referred to as felicitous conditions.

2.4 The Locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts

The three fundamental parts that make up a speech act are the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary actions. In a nutshell, Leech (Leech, 1983: 199) describes them as follows:

An act of locution is the act of saying something; an act of illocution is the act of saying something.

 -perlocutionary act: the performance of an act through speech

208

While the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts provide a more complex message to the listener, the locutionary act can be seen as the simple utterance of some words in a particular language. A perlocutionary act indicates the influence the speaker desires to have over the hearer, whereas an illocutionary act exposes the speaker's objectives behind the locution (Levinson,1983: 236(.

A straightforward example may be used to illustrate this:

4. Would you close the door, please?

This utterance's surface form and locutionary deed both have an inquiry with a distinct substance (Close the door.) The illocutionary act transmits the speaker's request, and the perlocutionary act reveals the speaker's want for the hearer to go and shut the door (Lyons, 1981: 175(.

But it's not always possible to quickly distinguish between the various components. They are largely intimately connected, according to Bach and Harnish (1979:3). I will first address each of them individually to help you understand how they fit into a speaking act.

1 Locutionary Acts

When commenting on Austin's work, it should be noted that Austin(1962:76) distinguished three parts of the locutionary act. This part of the speech act is perhaps the least unclear. Austin asserts that in order to speak, one must: A. constantly make specific noises (a phonetic act(

B. to consistently use a certain vocable or set of words (a phatic act(

C. Typically, to use that [sentence] or its parts with a specific, more or less definite "sense" and a specific, more or less definite "reference," which combined are comparable to "meaning" (rhetic act).

This separation implies that the locutionary act also consists of the phonetic, phatic, and rhetic "subacts." The concept of locutionary act in general, as well as this distinction, was frequently attacked by Austin's supporters. Even further, Searle offers his own classification in place of Austin's. As a result, he recommends another word, the so-called propositional act, which represents the proposition. Searle cautions that Austin's rhetic act is nothing more than a recast description of the illocutionary act (a neutral phrase without illocutionary force.(

A proposition is, in other words, the utterance's substance. Wardhaugh proposes the following rationale (Searle, 1968: 412).

Propositional acts are those that include referring to and predicating; we use language to refer to things in the outside world and to predict things about them. Speech actions cannot be proposed alone since they would be incomplete. Thus, the proposition is stated by an illocutionary deed. It's important to note that not all illocutionary activities always have a proposition (Searle observes that expressions like "Ouch!" or "Damn!" are "propositionless" utterances) (Searle, 1976:30).

Searle alters the statement after defining the proposition and propositional acts.

According to Austin's theories and assertions, there are propositional actions, illocutionary acts, and utterance acts. Searle (1976:24) describes utterance acts as merely uttering morphemes, words, and sentences. The idea of speech acts includes

utterance actions as well as propositional acts, although illocutionary acts are probably the subject that linguists focus on the most (Bach and Harnish 1979: 19).

2 Illocutionary Acts

The idea of speech actions is said to be centered on illocutionary activities. An illocutionary act, as stated above, is the activity taken by the speaker to produce a certain speech. Illocutionary acts like as asserting, inquiring, promising, demanding, issuing directives, threatening, and many others are intimately related to the speaker's intents. According to Yule (Yule, 1996: 48), the communicative force of a speech, also referred to as the illocutionary force of the utterance, is how the illocutionary act is thus carried out. The illocutionary act essentially directs how the entire statement is to be understood in the context of the dialogue.

Sometimes it might be difficult to tell what type of illocutionary act the speaker is engaging in. The speaker employs a variety of cues to imply his intentions and demonstrate how the proposition should be understood, from the most straightforward ones, like unambiguous performative verbs, to the more enigmatic ones, chief among which should be stressed are various paralinguistic features (stress, timbre, and intonation) and word order. Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices, or IFID, are all of these cues, or elements, impacting the meaning of the speech, as Yule refers to earlier work by Searle (Yule, 1996: 49).

It is also required for the hearer to be familiar with the context in which the speech act occurs in order to appropriately decode the illocutionary act done by the speaker. Without first taking into account, or perhaps even creating, the right context, one should not assume that a speech act is occurring. Another crucial point to keep in mind while encoding or decoding speech acts is that some speech acts may be culturally distinctive, which is why they cannot be used in all contexts. Mey demonstrates this using American and French customs. He illustrates the cultural differences using a French statement. But you do not understand! (Rough translation: "But you don't comprehend!") While a French person might find this phrase quite appropriate, an American would find it offensive because he might see it as a jab at his intelligence or level of comprehension (Mey, 1993: 133).

The way that speech actions are understood varies among cultures, making it easy for someone from a different background to understand the speaker's illocutionary act incorrectly. Consequently, it also follows that "the illocutionary speech act is communicatively successful only if the hearer recognizes the speaker's illocutionary aim." Since the hearer's comprehension is required for illocutionary intents to be fulfilled, these intentions are inherently communicative. Such intents are also reflexive. Their acknowledgement is what makes them happy (Bach and Harnish, 1979: 15).

3 Perlocutionary Acts

The third component of Austin's description of speech acts, perlocutionary acts, is conducted with the goal of having a further impact on the listener. Although it may appear that perlocutionary and illocutionary behaviors are not particularly different from one another at times, there is a key distinction between the two. The easiest way

to convey the two levels of success in illocutionary and perlocutionary acts is with a clear example (Thomas, 1995: 38).

Would you shut the door, please?

When seen just as an illocutionary act (in this example, a request), the act is effective if the hearer realizes that he has to shut the door; nevertheless, when viewed as a perlocutionary act, it only succeeds if the hearer actually does so. There are various statements that aim to influence the listener in some manner; some do so directly, while others are more tactful or courteous and choose to utilize indirect communication.

2.5 Felicity Conditions

Austin introduced the concept of felicity conditions and provided the following definitions (Austin, 1962: 14–15:(

A. There must be an acknowledged customary method with a specific conventional result, and that technique must entail the use of certain words by specific individuals under specific conditions.

B. The specific individuals and facts of a given situation must be appropriate for the use of the specific technique employed.

C. Every participant must carry out the operation accurately and thoroughly.

D. When a procedure is intended to be used by people who have specific thoughts or feelings or to launch specific subsequent behavior on the part of any participant, as is frequently the case, the person participating in the procedure and doing so must intend to act in that way and must also act in that way afterward.

Austin's illustration of a happy marriage in relation to the circumstances.

When describing the institution of marriage, Thomas, for example, notes that in western societies, "this conventional procedure involves a man and a woman, who are not prohibited from marrying for any reason, presenting themselves before an authorized person (minister of religion or registrar), in an authorized setting (place of worship or registry place), at an approved time (certain days or times are excluded), accompanied by a minimum of two witnesses. They must follow a certain procedure for being married since it isn't lawful until certain statements are made and certain phrases are said (Ibid.).

The act is only deemed legal after all the felicity requirements have been satisfied. However, this practice is frequently not universal because cultures and nations have different conventions. For instance, the marriage ritual differs greatly across the Islamic world. The bride requires a wali (male relative) to act on her behalf because she is unable to do so and without his presence the marriage would be void and unlawful. Additionally culturally distinctive, the statements and terms used deviate from the standard European formulae.

For all of this, there must be a specific conventional procedure with the proper circumstances and parties involved, it must be carried out accurately and completely, the parties involved must have the necessary thoughts, feelings, and intentions, and if subsequent conduct is called for, the relevant parties must follow it. Thomas (1995, p. 37)

In general, an act is only completely lawful when certain favorable circumstances are satisfied. The phrase "folly conditions" is still in use, and it is no longer just used to performatives. According to Yule (Yule, 1996: 50), felicity conditions include situations that are expected or acceptable for a speech act to be regarded as intended. He then suggests additional categorization of felicity circumstances into five types, including general conditions, content conditions, preparation conditions, sincerity conditions, and necessary conditions, based on the basic assumptions made by Searle (Ibid.).

2.6 Classification of Speech Act
1. Austin's Classification of Speech Acts
Austin (1962: 150-163) distinguishes five classes of utterance classified according to their illocutionary force:

1. Verdictives: They "consist in the delivering of a finding, official or unofficial, upon evidence or reasons as to value or fact, so far as these are distinguishable." (ibid.:152). They are typified by the giving of a verdict by a jury, arbitrator, or umpire.
Example: rank, grade, call, define, analyse.
2. Exercitives: "the giving of a decision in favour of or against a certain course of action, or advocacy of it. It is a decision that something is to be so, as distinct from a judgment that it is so."(ibid.:154) It is exercising of powers, rights or influences.
Example: order, request, beg, dare.
3. Commissives: They "commit the speaker to a certain course of action." (ibid.:156)
Example: promise, guarantee, refuse, decline.
4. Behabitives: They include "the notion of reaction to other people's behaviour and fortunes and of attitudes and expressions of attitudes to someone else's past conduct or imminent conduct." (ibid.:159)
Example: thank, congratulate, criticize.
5. Expositives: They involve the "expounding of views, the conducting of arguments, and the clarifying of usages and of references." (ibid.:160)
Example: state, contend, insist, deny, remind, guess.
2. Searle's Classification of Illocutionary Acts:
Five categories of speech activities are recognized by Searle (1975: 355-27:(

1. Assertives: They reflect the speaker's conviction in the claim and have a truth value. They also demonstrate word-to-world fit.
(p.355). Consider statements.
2. Directives: These are attempts to persuade the listener to take action; as a result, they demonstrate the world-to-word fit and convey the speaker's want or desire that the listener take action.
For instance, orders
3. Commissives: They bind Speaker to a future course of action in order to demonstrate that they are world-to-words appropriate, and Speaker conveys the desire to conduct A. promises, for instance, on page 356

4. Expressives: They convey the speaker's perspective on an issue that is briefly (if at all) mentioned in the propositional content (e.g., I apologize for stepping on your toe). Congratulations are an example of propositional content that must be connected to the Speaker or Hearer (p. 357). There is no direction of fit, a diversity of various psychological states, or other requirements.

5. Declarations: They provide correspondence between the propositional content and the external environment; as a result, the direction of fit is both words-to-world and world-to-words. For statements, Searle does not acknowledge any psychological state. (ibid.)

3. Methodology
3.1 Analysis of The Data

Finding Austin's Classification of Speech Acts of Joe Biden's victory speech is the first stage in this research. Joe Biden uses the words "commissive" and "verdictive" most frequently in his speeches.

The researcher employed a method of data collection in this investigation. This approach was utilized by the researcher to demonstrate how the data were gathered prior to analysis. The author used the following techniques to finish writing.

The descriptive technique was applied by the researcher for assessing the data. He has taken several actions, including:

.1The researcher looked examined how the sentences in the text of Joe Biden's victory speech related to one another. Before identifying the relationship between the sentences, he gathered samples and observed them as a whole.

.2The author documented every Austin classification and Searle classification found in the text of Joe Biden's victory speech. The researcher then separates them into distinct notes.

3. The forms of speech act were examined by the researcher. From the detailed notes, the writer analyzes the speech act categories and determines their formats.

4. The researcher used a descriptive approach to explain the data's findings, which is focused with providing some justifications for the research's conclusions or findings.

5. Based on the analysis's findings, the author came to a conclusion.

Table (1): Freguency of Austin's Classification of Speech Act in "Joe Biden's victory speech"

Types of speech act	Frequency of Occurence	%
Verdictives	1	11.11 %
Exercitives	1	11.11%
Commissives	6	66.66%
Behabitives	1	11.11 %
Expositives	0	0 %
Total	9	100%

Table (2): Freguency of Searle's Classification of Illocutionary Acts in " Joe Biden's victory speech"

Type of speech act	Frequency of Occurence	%
Assertives	6	27.27 %
Directives	1	4.54 %
Commissives	10	45.45 %
Expressives	2	9.09%
Declarations	3	13.63 %
Total	22	100%

3.3 Findings and Discussion

It is noticed in table (1) that used Austin's Classification of Speech Acts in the text under have frequency of (9) and its percentage is (100%) which are distinguished as follows:

1. Verdictives 1 (11.11 %).
2. Exercitives and Behabitives 1 (11.11%).
3. Commissives 6 (66.66%).
4. Expositives 0 (0%).

Concerning table (2), Searle's Classification of Illocutionary Acts in " **Joe Biden's victory speech** " have frequency of (22) (100%) Which are distinguished as follows:

1. Commissive 10 (45.45%)
2. Assertive 6 (27.27%).
3. Expressive 2 (9.09%)
4. Directives 1 (4.54%)
5. Declarations 3 (13.63%)

There is a great deal of variation in the frequency of speech act ties in almost every category . some categories are highly recurrent like "Commissives" and " assertive". This may be due to the fact that **Joe Biden** wants to avoid the ideas relate to each other while the less use of " Exercitives " and "Behabitives" shows that he wants to clarify the meaning and to avoid ambiguity and misunderstanding in his speech. Each types of speech functions different meaning, this is answer the first question. The types that used in his speech are (commissive, assertive, expessive, declarative, verdictives Exercitives and Behabitives), this answer the second question. The most dominant type of Austin's classification and Searle's classification which are found in the text of the **Joe Biden's victory speech** is (commissive , assertive and declarative), this answer the third question.

4. Conclusion

 The goal stated above was formalized in section one in three questions, which formed the foundation of this piece of research. As a result of the investigation of the subject along those lines, the study has come out with the following conclusions, all of which support the questions referred to above:

214

The Speech Act Theory is applicable to **Joe Biden's victory speech** , which can be analyzed in terms of Austin's classification and Searle's classification . This supports question no. 1, which says, " Each types of speech functions different meaning"

There is correspondence between the types of speech act with respect to the use of speech acts in delivering moral instructions **Joe Biden's victory speech** . This finding validates question no. 2, which predicts such correspondence.

5. Bibliography

1. Austin, J. (1962) How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Bach, K. and R. M. Harnish (1979) *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
3. Clarck, H.H. and T.B. Carlson(1982) *Speech Acts and Hearer's Beliefs*.New York: Academic Press.
4. Justová, V(2006). *Direct and Indirect Speech Acts in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Leech, G. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
6. Lyons, J.(1977) *Semantics*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
7. Levinson, S.(1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .
8. Mey , J. (1993) *Pragmatics : An Introduction* . Oxford : Basil Blackwell.
9. Patil, Z.N.(1994) *Style in Indian English Fiction* .Delhi: Prestige
10. Searle, J.R. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Searle, J. R.(1976). *Speech Acts*. London: Cambridge University Press.
12. Searle, J. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Schiffrin, D.(1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
14. Stelmann, M.,Jr.(1982) *Speech Act Theory and Writing*. London:London Academic Press.
15. Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction. An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
16. Wardhaugh, R.(1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
17. Yule , G. (1996) *Pragmatics* . Oxford : Oxford University Press.
18. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/11/07/annotated-biden-victory-speech/

215